IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JAMES SHORE 1602 Barker Circle West Chester, PA 19380	: : :	CIVIL ACTION NO.:
Plaintiff,	:	
v. ACE LIMOUSINE AND AIRPORT SERVICE, LLC 167 Keystone Road Chester, PA 19013	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendant.	:	

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

James Shore (*hereinafter* referred to as "Plaintiff," unless indicated otherwise) by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff has initiated this action to redress violations by Ace Limousine and Airport Service, LLC (*hereinafter* referred to as "Defendant") of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA" – 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 *et seq.*) and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA"). As a direct consequence of Defendant's unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

¹ Plaintiff's claims under the PHRA are referenced herein for notice purposes. He is required to wait 1 full year before initiating a lawsuit from date of dual-filing with the EEOC. Plaintiff must however file his lawsuit in advance of same because of the date of issuance of his federal right-to-sue-letter under the ADEA. Plaintiff's PHRA claims however will mirror identically his federal claims under the ADEA.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a)(4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violations of federal laws. There lies supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims because they arise out of the same common nucleus of operative facts as Plaintiff's federal claims asserted herein.
- 3. This Court may properly assert personal jurisdiction over Defendant because its contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendant to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945), and its progeny.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because Defendant is deemed to reside where it is subjected to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendant a resident of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 5. Plaintiff is proceeding herein (in part) under the ADEA after properly exhausting all administrative remedies with respect to such claims by timely filing a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and by filing the instant lawsuit within ninety ("90") days of receiving a notice of dismissal and/or right to sue letter from the EEOC.

PARTIES

- 6. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 7. Plaintiff is an adult individual with an address as set forth in the above-caption.

- 8. Ace Limousine and Airport Service, LLC is a full-service ground transportation provider with an address as set forth in the above-caption.
- 9. At all relevant times herein, Defendant acted by and through its agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for the Defendant.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 10. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 11. Plaintiff is a 74-year-old male with a valid driver's license and over a decade of experience as a chauffeur.
- 12. In or about April of 2021, Plaintiff applied to an ad for a chauffeur role with the capability of earning up to \$1,000.00 per week working for Defendant.
- 13. On or about Tuesday, April 6, 2021, Plaintiff interviewed with an operational manager named Andy (age 30s, last name unknown, *hereinafter* "Andy), who is upon information and belief, also a son of Defendant's primary owner.
- 14. In conjunction with his aforesaid interview, Plaintiff was scheduled for a test drive (which took place on or about Wednesday, April 7, 2021).
- 15. The aforesaid April 7, 2021 test drive was administered by a woman named Josey (last name unknown, *hereinafter* "Josey").
- 16. Upon completing the aforesaid application process (interview and test drive) with Defendant, Plaintiff was not hired and/or was denied the chauffeur position.
- 17. When Andy communicated the denial of the aforesaid Chauffeur position to Plaintiff, he identified the following 3 reasons for not hiring Plaintiff:

- a. Andy expressly and unequivocally informed Plaintiff that he was not hired because, "I [Andy] was a little concerned about your age";²
- b. Andy implied that Plaintiff appeared frail, explaining he was worried Plaintiff could not lift some heavier luggage because when he interviewed Plaintiff, Plaintiff purportedly needed help and could not even open a water bottle, which is patently untrue. Rather, because Plaintiff had been in an interview and accepted a bottle of water, he was carefully opening it to not spill anything and make a good impression. Despite the fact that Plaintiff did not require any assistance, Andy insisted on opening the bottle for Plaintiff. Plaintiff attributes this perception of his frailty or perceived weakness to his age, as Andy had already verbally expressed worry about Plaintiff being too old to do perform the duties of the Chauffeur position; and
- c. Andy informed Plaintiff he drove a little "rough" on the test drive, without further elaboration, which is completely pretextual given Andy's aforesaid age-related discriminatory comments. Moreover, Plaintiff is not a neophyte to driving or chauffeuring and would have driven just fine if not for his discriminatory nonhiring.

² Where a plaintiff presents sufficient direct evidence, the Court need not consider whether that claim may proceed under a *McDonnell Douglas* theory. *See Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 511 (2002) ("'[T]he *McDonnell Douglas* test is inapplicable where the plaintiff presents direct evidence of discrimination." (quoting *Trans World Airlines, Inc. v. Thurston*, 469 U.S. 111, 121 (1985))). "[I]n *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.*, the Supreme Court further held that a plaintiff bringing an age discrimination claim "must prove by a preponderance of the evidence (which may be direct or circumstantial) that age was the 'but-for' cause of the challenged employer decision." *Cellucci v. RBS Citizens, N.A.*, 987 F. Supp. 2d 578, 586 (E.D. Pa. 2013)(citation omitted). Direct evidence means evidence sufficient to allow the jury to find that "the 'decision makers placed substantial negative reliance on [the plaintiff's age] in reaching their decision" to fire him. *Connors v. Chrysler Fin. Corp.*, 160 F.3d 971, 976 (3d Cir. 1998) (quoting *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, 490 U.S. 228, 277 (1989) (O'Connor, J., concurring); *see also Anderson v. Consol. Rail Corp.*, 297 F.3d 242, 248 (3d Cir. 2002) (same). Such evidence "leads not only to a ready logical inference of bias, but also to a rational presumption that the person expressing bias acted on it" when he made the challenged employment decision. *Starceski v. Westinghouse Elec. Corp.*, 54 F.3d 1089, 1097 (3d Cir. 1995).

18. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers and that he was not hired and/or was denied employment with Defendant because of his advanced age.

COUNT I

<u>Violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA")</u> ([1] Age Discrimination & [2] Failure to Hire)

- 19. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 20. In or about April of 2021, Plaintiff applied for a Chauffer position with Defendant.
- 21. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that he was treated disparately with respect to the interview process contrary to individuals substantially younger than him.
- 22. Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff by refusing to hire him because of his advanced age.
- 23. Specifically, Defendant's management informed Plaintiff that he was not being hired and/or was denied employment with Defendant because Defendant's management was "concerned about [Plaintiff's] age.
- 24. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers that he was not hired and/or was denied employment with Defendant because of his advanced age.
- 25. These actions as aforesaid constitute unlawful age discrimination under the ADEA.

 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:
- A. Defendant is to promulgate and adhere to a policy prohibiting discrimination in the future against any employee(s);
- B. Defendant is to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendant's

illegal actions, including but not limited to back pay, front pay, salary pay increases, bonuses,

insurance, benefits, training, promotions, reinstatement and seniority;

C. Plaintiff is to be awarded liquidated damages as permitted by applicable law, in an

amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendant for its willful,

deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendant or other employers from

engaging in such misconduct in the future;

D. Plaintiff is to be accorded other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just,

proper and appropriate (including but not limited to damages for emotional distress, pain, suffering

and humiliation); and

E. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable

attorney's fees as provided by applicable federal and state law.

F. Plaintiff is to be given a jury trial as demanded in the caption of this Complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Ari R. Karpf, Esq. 3331 Street Road

Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128

Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

Dated: July 15, 2021

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

<u>Fel</u> ephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-4970	akarpf@karpf-law.com	***************************************
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for	
7/15/2021	A>	Plaintiff	
(f) Standard Management –	Cases that do not fall into	any one of the other tracks.	(X)
commonly referred to as the court. (See reverse s management cases.)	complex and that need spide of this form for a detail	*	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvi exposure to asbestos.	ing claims for personal inj	ury or property damage from	()
•		rbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
and Human Services den	ying plaintiff Social Secu		()
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases l		•	()
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	OLLOWING CASE MAN	AGEMENT TRACKS:	
plaintiff shall complete a Ca- filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the e designation, that defendant s the plaintiff and all other par to which that defendant belief	se Management Track Dese a copy on all defendants. event that a defendant does thall, with its first appearanties, a Case Management eves the case should be assected.		me of everse g said ve on
Ace Limousine and Airport	•	NO.	
v.	: :		
James Shor	re	CIVIL ACTION	4

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 2:21-cv-03152 DAGUS GRADE FILE FUND PAGE 8 of 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 1602 Barker Circle, West Chester, PA 19380						
Address of Defendant: 167 Keystone Road, Chester, PA 19013						
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendant's place of business						
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:						
Case Number:						
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:						
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year Yes No X previously terminated action in this court?						
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit Yes No X						
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?						
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No X						
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is / is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.						
DATE: 7/15/2021 ARK2484 / 91538						
Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)						
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)						
CIVIL: (Place a \(\sqrt{in one category only} \) A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. FELA 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Patent 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 9. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): 9. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): 9. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): 7. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): 7. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. FELA 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 9. All other Pederal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 7. Products Liability 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 8. Prod						

Case 2:21-cv-03152-JHS Document 1 Filed 07/15/21 Page 9 of 9 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil de	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	THIS FOR	eM.)	74, is required for the use of the	te Clerk of Court for the	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS			
SHORE, JAMES				ACE LIMOUSINE AND AIRPORT SERVICE, LLC			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)				
							Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, I Suite 128, Bensalem, PA
II RASIS OF HIRISDI	CTION (Place on "Y" in Or	na Rox Only)	III. CI	FIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) U.S. Government		(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF Citizen of This State 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4 of Business In This State					
2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State 5 5				
				n or Subject of a eign Country	3 Foreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		dy) RTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here for: Nature of BANKRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES	
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting X 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	J 690 TY J 710 720 740 790 J 460	EABOR Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Clabor/Management Relations O Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Note Inmigration Other Immigration Actions	' 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ' 423 Withdrawal	□ 375 False Claims Act ' 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
Proceeding Sta	moved from 3 tte Court Cite the U.S. Civil Sta ADEA (29USC6)	Appellate Court tute under which you are	•		er District Litigation Transfer		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of ca		RA				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: X Yes 'No	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 7/15/2021		SIGNATURE OF AT	ORNEY Q	FRECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		and the second s					
RECEIPT# AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUE	OGE	

Print

Save As...

Reset